

**REMARKS**

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 17, 2005. Claims 1 - 27 are now presented for examination. Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 14, 16, 19, 23, and 25 have been amended as indicated by the Examiner to correct informalities. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 10 and 19 are independent.

Favorable review is respectfully requested.

**Objections to the Claims:**

Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 14, 16, 19, 23 and 25 have been objected to by the Examiner due to various informalities. Claims 1, 5, 7, 10, 14, 16, 19, 23 and 25 have been amended as indicated by the Examiner to correct the informalities. Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 24, 26 and 27 are objected to under informalities because they depend on the objected claims. In view of the above amendments it is the Applicants' belief that any objections to the claims have been overcome.

The §102 rejection:

Claims 1 – 3, 5, 9 – 12, 14, 18 – 21, 23, and 27 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lenoski et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6,735,173.

As understood, Lenoski teaches a method to accumulate and distribute information within a packet switching system at a localized “mailbox” which includes a memory function which accumulates flow control information and distributes this information to the relevant destination. In contrast, the present invention detects congestion in a given out leg of a sub-port and transcribes or “piggybacks” this information to the corresponding in leg of the sub-port and the piggybacked information is then broadcast within the packet switch to all output ports and their respective sub-ports. The invention utilizes the full intrinsic performance of a multi-port switch by concentrating, through all port and sub-ports, the traffic of multiple independent transmission lines.

The Examiner has cited teachings in Lenoski for the mailbox to direct flow control information to all output ports (col. 10, line 13 – 18) and for piggybacking congestion information from a single destination to source (col. 15, lines 52 – 65). There is no teaching to broadcast a piggybacked congestion status to all output

ports, and therefore no teaching to broadcast the congestion status to all corresponding sub-ports as disclosed in independent claims 1, 10 and 19. Accordingly, Lenoski cannot anticipate independent claims 1, 10, and 19. Since claims 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 18, 20, 21, 23 and 27, depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, and 19, and since claims 1, 10, and 19 are believed to be allowable, then claims 2, 3, 5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 18, 20, 21, 23 and 27 are believed to be allowable as well.

The §103 rejection:

Claims 4, 6-8, 13, 16, 17, 22, and 24-26 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Lenoski et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6,735,173, in view of Park et al. U.S. Pat. No. 6,646,985.

Since claims 4, 6-8, 13, 16, 17, 22, and 24-26 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, and 19, and since claims 1, 10, and 19 are believed to be allowable, then claims 4, 6-8, 13, 16, 17, 22, and 24-26 are believed to be allowable as well.


Summary:

In view of all the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that any objections or rejections to this application be reconsidered and withdrawn. Further action with respect to the present application is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner finds this application is deficient in any respect, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's earliest possible convenience.

For the foregoing reasons, allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
**Bernard Brezzo, et al.**

By:

  
James J. Cioffi, Attorney  
Registration No. 51,564  
Telephone: (845) 894-3363

JJC/hh